



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NUMBER	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED APPLICANT	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
--------------------	-------------	-----------------------	---------------------

EXAMINER

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

23

DATE MAILED:

INTERVIEW SUMMARY

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

- (1) MICHAEL BAK (Ex.) (3) Andrew Torrence (App. Rep.)
(2) Yvonne Eyles (SP. Ex.) (4) Janis Fraser (App. Rep.)

Date of Interview 2/14/02

Type: ☒ Telephonic ☐ Personal (copy is given to ☐ applicant ☐ applicant's representative).

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: ☐ Yes ☒ No If yes, brief description: _____

Agreement ☐ was reached. ☒ was not reached.

Claim(s) discussed: PENDING

Identification of prior art discussed: Yang et al.

Description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: The Applicant's rep. argued that claim 33 limitation was taken from previous claim 35 and thus should be entered. Examiner indicated that the new claims 78-81 contained SEQUENCE: 5-6 limitations which require new search and consideration. Applicant argued that if the new claim 23 w/ the "transcribed... aspect in vector... " entered would overcome the Yang reference. Examiner agreed. The 35 USC 112p2 - "fragment" quote is clear since it is the fragment of the limitation. Examiner agreed that the fragment should not be applied. Applicant argued that "hydrogenation" 112p2 is clear because of page 25 of specification which states the specific high strength hydrogenation condition. Examiner suggested that if it is the defect of the term "high strength" then it is OK. Or can put that limitation in the claim. The 112p1

SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW registration was related to the generic language of molecular weight and the description "high strength" means other receptors.

Michael D. Bak